THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII SEPTEMBER, 1955 No. 423

EDITORIAL NOTE

THE following article by the Bishop of Rochester calls attention to an important question which has not yet been sufficiently considered by the Convocations or by churchmen generally. We shall be glad to receive correspondence on the subject, not least from any who would dispute the Bishop's premisses or who have alternative solutions to propose for a problem which in practice is likely to become more and more insistent.

Priests and Frequent Communion

DURING the revision of the Canons, at the autumn Sessions of Convocation, 1954, both Canterbury and York were asked to add to the new Canons on Holy Communion a clause from Canon XXI (1603) ordering that "Every Minister, as often as he shall celebrate the Holy Communion, shall receive that sacrament himself."

In the Upper House of Canterbury, I took it upon myself to warn the Bishops that this was no matter of inserting into the Revised Canons a forgotten detail of procedure in the administration of Holy Communion, but that it raised a large and important issue that had never yet been given the consideration it demanded in the councils of the Church of England. In 1603 it was never contemplated that there would be more than one celebration on a Sunday. Indeed, the title of Canon XXI (1603) runs: "The Communion to be Thrice a Year received." The Canon, moreover, was aimed at Puritans who often refrained from partaking even at the monthly Communion which was becoming customary (Scudamore, p. 692). Thus, the Visitation Articles of the period ask the question: "Doth your Minister receive the same himself on every day [*not every time*] that he administereth it?" Likewise, in those days, the Communion of the Sick was a relatively infrequent ministry; more especially as there were then as many as ten thousand clergy with the charge of only five and a half million souls (G. M. Trevelyan, *English Social History*, p. 277).

To-day the situation is so entirely different that it would be a serious mistake to lift a clause from an out-of-date Canon and incorporate it, without reflection, into the Revised Canon Law of the twentieth century. Nowadays short-handed parish priests generally celebrate twice a Sunday, and as many as four or five times on a great festival. Many of them have more than one church to serve, both of which require a Eucharist on the Sunday. Moreover, the number of Private

Communions occupies them hour after hour at the great festivals. In both world wars Chaplains had experience of whole Sundays which were a succession of celebrations, one after the other; and a like situation, where there are hospitals or institutions to serve, can confront a parish priest in normal times. In the first world war the necessity of providing Holy Communion for a succession of little groups of soldiers on the same day presented me with a distressing spiritual problem which, as I have discovered, was shared by many other Chaplains in both wars. Though I strove to receive the Sacrament with a different intention on each occasion, I found my reception becoming impersonal, and even mechanical. On taking advice I was informed (with what authority I have never been able to verify) that when the Oxford Movement, following upon the Evangelical Revival, gave rise to the relatively modern practice of more frequent Sunday celebrations, as also of greater frequency in communicating, it was quite customary for the celebrant to communicate at the first consecration only and to consider subsequent Communions as extensions of the first. The practice was considered to be consistent with the invariable custom that a priest does not communicate again when there is a second consecration at the same celebration.

In Convocation the Bishop of Derby supported my plea for further consideration of the matter. He agreed that enormous parishes, an understaffed ministry, and the welcome reawakening of the habit of frequent communion had created a changed situation; and with it the kind of problem to which I had drawn attention. He felt, too, that the sort of objection of an "incomplete" Sacrament which could be theoretically raised to the kind of practice I had described could, by parity of reasoning, be advanced against Communion with the Reserved Sacrament. More particularly, he considered that a use by which a parish priest, without necessarily himself communicating at a Private Communion, could explain to sick or aged persons that the celebration in their room was an extension of Communion in the parish church was not one to be ruled out unsympathetically, or indeed at all. With this the Bishops of Lichfield and Birmingham agreed. Accordingly, the Bishops decided to defer their decision till the question had been referred to the Lower House and its advice had been sought. Unfortunately, on that same day, both the Lower House of Canterbury and the Convocation of York accepted the additional clause from Canon XXI (1603) without question or debate. In these circumstances the Bishops decided to let matters rest as they were.

At the same time, the frequent reception of the Sacrament by a priest on the same day is (to quote the Archbishop) "a problem of real importance". It is one that affects the spiritual welfare of heavily taxed parish priests, and must be a matter of deep concern to many of them; though possibly remote from the purview of the Convocations. I am anxious, therefore, to place the problem fairly and squarely before the Church.

The Rule of One Communion only on One Day

It is incontestable that, according to the immemorial judgment of the Church, no one, priest or layman, should receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ more than once on the same day. Though Henry VIII might *attend* three Masses even on hunting days, he only *received* the Sacrament once a year, at Easter. When therefore, Gratian's *Decretum* (*c.* A.D. 1140) formulated, as an already existing rule of the Church, that the celebrating priest must himself communicate in both kinds *every time* he consecrates, not more than a daily celebration was contemplated. Similarly, a priest of the Orthodox Church is still not allowed to celebrate more than one Liturgy a day. The fifth Canon of the Council of Toledo (A.D. 681), it is true, condemned certain priests who, when obliged to celebrate more than once a day, communicated only at the last celebration. The Council argued: "Behold the Apostle says, Are not they which eat the victims partakers of the altar? . . . What kind of sacrifice will that be of which *not even* the sacrificer is known to have partaken?" But, as the words "not even" show, at the celebrations in question the worshippers were not in the habit of partaking, and the celebrant was supposed to receive for them as well as for himself. On the other hand, the custom thus condemned is evidence that priests have always had scruples about communicating more than once a day. In England, the Canon of Stephen (A.D. 1207–29) "straitly" forbids "any priest to celebrate twice on one day, except Christmas Day and Easter Day", or in the case of funerals. It is significant that the Canon also enjoins that "if the priest, after he have received the Lord's Body and Blood, must celebrate again the same day", he is not to consume the lavations. In the language of the times, a distinction was drawn between "sacramental" reception (sinners could thus receive) and that which was also "spiritual". The Canon of Stephen is, again, further evidence of scruples regarding such "sacramental" (or impersonal) reception at a second celebration on the same day, and so to be avoided unless absolutely necessary.

The Reformers evidently accepted the common usage of not more than one Communion on one day; for, in A.D. 1552, they withdrew the provision that had been made in the First Prayer Book (A.D. 1549) for a second Communion at Christmas and Easter. It should also be remarked that although the rubric of the present Prayer Book orders that the Minister shall "first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner (if any be present)", according to universal practice the rule is not held to refer to priests assisting at a second celebration; though the wording hardly countenances such an interpretation. The truth is that in 1662 a second celebration was not contemplated.

This age-long use of not more than one Communion on the same day would show that the Church has always been solicitously aware of the danger of blunted spiritual apprehension through too frequent reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. In celebrating the Holy

Communion a priest can be reverently impersonal. Very humbly, he knows himself to be the necessary organ of the action of the body of the Church. He is the voice and the hands of the consecrating Church, which is the Body of Christ (see Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 213). Thus even "evil" Ministers can consecrate a valid Sacrament (Article XXVI). But the reception of the Blessed Sacrament is quite a different matter. It is an intensely personal transaction between the Living Christ and the individual soul. This truth, set forth with awful solemnity in the concluding portion of the earliest description of Holy Communion (1 Cor. 11. 23–end), accounts for the reluctance of the laity from the fourth century onwards to communicate with any frequency (Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 18, 19).

To-day, by the multiplying of services, priests are even more exposed than those condemned by the Council of Toledo in the seventh century, or those for whose spiritual welfare Archbishop Stephen Langton legislated in the thirteenth century, to the danger of receiving "unworthily" the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ at celebration after celebration on the same day. Moreover, to have recourse to the expedient of the Middle Ages, and to receive "sacramentally", or impersonally, leads inevitably to the blunting of spiritual discernment, and to be forced to "take this holy Sacrament" in a manner that the laity in general, all down the centuries, have been almost over-careful to avoid.

Seeing, then, that the immemorial rule of the Church against a priest celebrating more than once a day has increasingly been disregarded during the past century, it must follow that the Church can no longer be bound by a Canon framed upon it; but should carefully review the rubric requiring that the Minister shall "first receive the Communion in both kinds" whenever he is called upon to celebrate more than once on the same day.

The Objection of an Incomplete Sacrament

The general objection of "incompleteness" advanced against the suggestion of a celebrant not communicating himself more frequently than once on the same day is twofold in character. Reception by the priest is held to be necessary, first, to "complete" the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and, secondly, in order that the priest, as the representative of the whole Church, should express by his own action the full intention of the rite which he is celebrating.

(1) *As regards the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, opinion is strongly divided as to its nature.

(*a*) *The Roman Catholic view* is that Christ is mystically slain in the "unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass" to be a true, proper, propitiatory sacrifice offered to God for the living and the dead. As such, the celebrant must partake of the consecrated Host for the completion of the sacrifice: in that the consumption of the species forms an integral part of the sacrifice. It is, indeed, the entombment of the Victim (*Cath. Dic.*, Addis and Arnold, pp. 220, 352). This doctrine need not detain us, for it is repudiated by the XXIst Article of Religion.

(*b*) *A widely held Anglo-Catholic view* is that at the Eucharist the

Church on earth associates itself with a Perpetual Sacrifice offered by Christ in heaven. As Bishop Gore sets forth so convincingly in his book, *The Body of Christ*, the doctrine demands the communion of the people equally with that of the priest. It is curious, therefore, that those who might be most opposed to the suggestion of a non-communicating priest at a celebration are those who seem to have little or no objection to a non-communicating congregation. If, therefore, a solitary priest can represent the whole Church in his participation in the sacrifice, the body of worshippers are even more truly representative of the whole Priestly Laos by partaking of the sacrificial symbols of the Eucharistic Offering. In any case, seeing that there is no time in the heavenlies, a priest who has already "duly received these holy mysteries" can only be regarded as being still a very member "incorporate in the mystical body" of Christ when he celebrates later on the same day. Otherwise that must be an "incomplete" Eucharist for those who are communicated from a second consecration at the same celebration; at which (as has already been pointed out) the celebrant does not himself receive again. Thus, the theological objection of "incompleteness" seems to disappear if the consecration at a later celebration is considered as an extension of the first: even as is the case with a second consecration at the same celebration.

(*c*) *The Evangelical view* (shared by many Anglo-Catholics) of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that it is the corporate offering of the worshippers, incorporate in Christ through the reception of the Sacrament, and presenting themselves unto the Father as the Body of Christ, and in his Name or Person. It is the doctrine, more especially, expressed in Liturgies where the Prayer of Oblation is placed after the communion of the people. Here the arguments advanced above for the "completeness" of the sacrifice, despite a non-communicating celebrant, apply with even greater force. For the whole movement of the Liturgy is that of communicants drawing near with faith to take this holy Sacrament, in order to become "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2. 5). It is the Body of the Priestly Church, rather than its ordained Voice and Hands, that is essential for such a living sacrifice.

(2) *There remains the further objection arising from the conception of the priest as the representative of the whole Church.* As such, it is contended, his reception at each celebration is necessary to "complete" the intention of the Communion. It is true that the priest represents the whole Church in the *consecration* of the Sacrament, but the history of the doctrine would show that he does not represent the whole Church in the *reception* of the Sacrament, *if there is a communicating congregation.* The conception of the priest representing the whole Church in the matter of reception seems to have arisen early in the ninth century by reason of the increasing development of non-communicating attendance by the laity. Thus Strabo (d. A.D. 849) could argue that "when the priests celebrate masses alone, it may be understood that they for whom those offices are celebrated, and whom the priest in certain responses represents, co-operate with him in that action" (*De Reb. Eccl.*, c. 22). In course

of time the doctrine took more formal shape. Thus Hugh of St Victor (A.D. 1097–1141) writes in the early part of the twelfth century that "all the faithful communicate in the Body of Christ, because the Minister takes it sacramentally for all, that it may be received spiritually by himself and all" (*Specul. Myst. Eccl.*, c. 7). Indeed, St Vincent Ferrer, and others, picture the celebrating priest as the "mouth" of the Body, not because he pronounces on behalf of the whole Church the words of consecration, but as receiving the Sacrament on behalf of a non-communicating congregation. "The mouth eats and receives food, and all the other members are refreshed. The same with the Sacrament of the altar. All Christendom is one body, united by faith and charity, having many members. The priest is the mouth of this body. When therefore the priest communicates all the members are refreshed" (*Serm. in Epiph.*, ii). The idea, therefore, that reception by the priest was necessary to "complete" the purpose of reception at a celebration was dictated by the need of "completing" a reception in which the laity did not partake. The position is very different in the Church of England, where no celebration is allowed except there be a communicating congregation. With us the communicating laity, not the priest, are the "mouth" of the Church, seeing that they represent the whole Laos of the Church. Moreover, where the laity "duly receive these holy mysteries" of the Body and Blood of their divine Saviour, we pass from symbolism into reality, and the Living Christ himself (not the celebrating priest) becomes the incorporating Factor at Holy Communion, conjoining into one the local congregation with "the blessed company of all faithful people" in his mystical Body.

Furthermore, where, by the non-reception of the celebrant, subsequent Communions are considered extensions of the first consecration on any one day, the officiating priest does, in a very real sense, link congregation with congregation, Church with Church, and the sick with those who have received at the open Communion.

A Twofold Plea

From all these considerations it seems difficult to sustain theoretical objections of "incompleteness" if a celebrant were allowed to communicate himself not more than once on the same day. On the other hand, even if these were still held in some sense to be of weight, they do not outweigh the practical and spiritual problem that (as the Church has always held) no priest ought to be required, for his own soul's sake, to receive the Sacrament oftener than once a day. In view, therefore, of the completely new conditions in modern times with regard to the ministry of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, a change is demanded with respect to its administration. I would therefore conclude with a twofold plea both on behalf of the afflicted members (more particularly) of the Flock of Christ and of the ordained Shepherds of his sheep.

(*a*) *In the Communion of the Sick* the 1928 Prayer Book makes provision for the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, not for the sake of the sick, but (as Archbishop Davidson made clear) for the

sake of "fasting priests". By this means, also, the problem is overcome of the frequent reception of the Sacrament by the priest on the same day. But the 1928 Prayer Book also enjoined that the sick were entitled to a private celebration if they so desired. Now, it is a matter of common experience that when in sickness or old age Christian people are weak, failing or fevered, they require assistance for their devotions; and that the recital and motions of the Prayer of Consecration have an immense value towards kindling in them "a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ", such as compassion would withhold only with extreme reluctance. If, in addition, they can be encouraged to feel that the celebration in the sick-room is an extension of the open Communion in church, linking them with the local worshipping community, a new sense of fellowship comforts their loneliness and lightens their depression.

(*b*) *There is, however, the hard-pressed parish priest* to be considered; and it must be the deep concern of the Sacred Synods of the Church to safeguard the Pastors of the Flock from all danger lest the faithful discharge of their ministry should be allowed to dull their spiritual apprehension of holy things. The Chief Shepherd, our Lord Jesus Christ, is as all-compassionate even as he is all-knowing. We may be assured that he will forgive, because he understands, if his servants, through frequency and familiarity in the duties of their sacred office, sometimes lose (to a greater or lesser degree) spiritual vision, and awe, and apprehension. But this does not excuse the Church from taking every precaution to save the clergy from the inherent danger of Holy Orders. In his life of Bishop Winnington-Ingram (p. 195), Dr S. C. Carpenter records his reply to one of his Chaplains who expressed his surprise that the Bishop did not communicate daily in his chapel at Fulham Palace. "From a boy I was brought up to regard Holy Communion as a treat, and one does not want treats too often." To deprive a parish priest of a sense of thrill and exaltation in receiving Holy Communion, because he is forced to communicate "too often" on the same day, is a tragedy that must be averted. Seeing, therefore, that the wise rule of the Church that her priests should not celebrate more than once a day has completely broken down, what are the Revised Canons going to do about it? It can be no answer to the problem merely to lift (without thought or reflection) from an out-of-date Canon, entitled "The Communion to be Thrice a Year received", a clause forbidding infrequent reception by the priest and to apply it to frequent receptions on the same day. I would rather plead that a new clause be added to meet modern needs and conditions, and that the revision might run somewhat as follows:

"When a Minister has already received the Sacrament of Holy Communion, if he must celebrate again on the same day, he need not communicate himself a second time, but all subsequent consecrations may be considered as extensions of the first consecration."

CHRISTOPHER ROFFEN:

The Story and the Fable

"THERE is a world of difference", writes J. S. Bezzant,[1] "between a faith with reasonable grounds, and a faith arising from hearing and responding to a message in no degree verifiable except in the response which itself demands faith in the message." Bultmann has protested that for him *Entmythologisierung* means not the elimination of myth but its interpretation. Nevertheless, with a Lutheran in such open revolt against the historical basis of nineteenth-century Christianity—as Luther himself was against the catholic basis of medieval Christianity—there is a danger that in the zeal of the reformer images will get broken; and it is with images that we are concerned.

The images of the mind—archetypes, Jung calls them—arise from basic human experiences and are inherited from a very remote past.[2] They "are experienced both as images and as emotions, and their effect is particularly noticeable in typical and significant human situations such as birth and death, triumph over natural obstacles, transitional stages of life, extreme danger or awe-inspiring experience. In these circumstances an archetypal image that might have been drawn in the caves of Auvergne will often appear in the dreams of the most modern of men. . . . The collective inherited unconscious can be inferred in the normal man from the obvious traces of mythological images in his dreams—images of which he had no previous conscious knowledge."[3] Myths are no mere primitive attempt to explain natural events *per se*; they are the expression of *how men experience these things*. Because they are a direct expression of the collective unconscious they are found in similar forms among all peoples and in all ages; and when man loses the capacity for myth-making he loses touch with the creative forces of his being. Poetry, folk-lore and fairy-tale[4] depend also on the same capacity—a sober scientific truth that some of our exegetic surgeons would do well to remember. Because these four things have in varying proportions conditioned my own outlook since childhood may I, in this paper, start with myself and work outwards?

What are the most vividly remembered moments of my own life? Some, undoubtedly, are concerned with actual events—though never with the whole event: always just a momentary snapshot of one part of it. The scene that in fact flashed to mind in answer to this question was the rock-strewn hillside of Montecassino one night when I accompanied my C.O. round his forward positions. We picked our way through briers in the faint starlight, trying not to kick the empty cans and small rocks with which the mountain face was littered; trying not to trip over more horrible reminders of where

[1] THEOLOGY, October 1954, p. 214.

[2] This theme underlies T. S. Eliot's *The Dry Salvages*, and is treated more directly in Rilke's *Third Elegy of Duino*.

[3] Fordham, *Introduction to Jung's Psychology*, p. 25.

[4] The vogue for science fiction is perhaps one of the happier spiritual signposts of our age!

we were. Suddenly, 200 yards away, a German flare went up, and we dropped down; and it is the Dante-esque scene that lay before us, down the ravine and up the other side to the fabulous monastery, more real than reality itself in the angry orange light—that is about the only *event* I think of, if asked in a hurry for the vivid moments of my life. Even so, it was hardly an event, for nothing happened (though plenty had gone before, and more was to follow).

The other pictures that come to mind of unforgettable moments are not in the least like what people talk about in newspaper interviews. They are mere random snapshots, taken for no apparent reason at all: the corner of a buttercup field in Wales near where I was born, with absolutely nothing happening; a walk along the seashore in Cornwall one early evening when I was ten, with the shelving surf forming a dais for the setting sun. Far more vivid than these is the memory of things that never happened at all: things that I have dreamt. I have known Castle Street, Christchurch, like the back of my hand for thirty years; yet as I think of it now as I saw it last week it seems like a meaningless shadow compared with a dream I once had. I stood on an ancient causeway where the street now runs, looking towards the sea across marshes so desolate that even the curlews were silent, under a lemon sky in which all tragedy since the foundation of the world seemed to have become—not incarnate, for there was no flesh; not embodied, for there was no body. There was an almost tangible quality, though, which cannot be conveyed in words and is yet all-important. One could call it spiritual significance, but I prefer the word *texture*. All dreams have texture; and I suggest that waking experience owes its significance, not to what actually happens, but to whether it does or does not possess this quality of texture.

Take, for example, the canals of Venice, which is perhaps one of Europe's more overrated beauty spots. They are picturesque in some weathers and they certainly make charming photos; but compare them with Canaletto's paintings of them. I can never look at a Canaletto without wanting to cry; not because his work is sad, but because his canvasses have a texture that seems to me to make them more significant than the original. In them are united what Edwin Muir calls "The Story and the Fable"—which is the title he chose for the first part of his autobiography.[1] "We extend", he says, "far beyond any boundary line which we can set for ourselves in the past and the future, and the life of every man is an endlessly repeated life of man. It is clear . . . that no autobiography can confine itself to conscious life, and that sleep, in which we pass a third of our existence, is a mode of experience, and our dreams a part of reality. In themselves our conscious lives may not be particularly interesting. But what we are not—and never can be—our fable, seems to me inconceivably interesting. I should like to write that fable, but I cannot even live it; and all I could do if I related the outward course of my life would be to show how I had deviated from it; though even that is impossible, since I do not know the fable, or anyone who

[1] Published 1940.

knows it."[1] "In real life", adds Kathleen Raine, "what is important is the interplay of story and fable, temporal and eternal, *anamnesis* and *mnemosyne*. Edwin Muir is a natural Neoplatonist, though he seldoms mentions philosophy. His *Life* is not only a record of a particular life, but an attempt to discover what life itself is."[2]

A natural Neoplatonist, though he seldom mentions philosophy. The Bourgeois Gentilhomme was impressed to discover that he had been talking prose all his life without realizing it. As we approach the study of myth and poetry we are approaching the province of men—many of whom were by no means highly educated by our standards—who were Neoplatonists without realizing it; and they certainly seldom mentioned philosophy.

The story and the fable—the story, which by itself is a mere newsreel devoid of significance; and the fable, which by itself is, like God, a thing of spirit, invisible, intangible, unable to be comprehended. Sometimes these two become united, however; and to those moments, as we look back upon them, time seems to have been irrelevant. Thus they really are in some measure eternal; and only then does the fable become incarnate and the story significant. That must often have happened to Canaletto; and as he happened to have learnt the technique of painting he has left us many pictures which are in a way greater than the subject which they portray. They show us a city of stone, timber and stagnant water *sub specie aeternitatis* (for this is what I take to be the real meaning of that phrase). The story and the fable keep on meeting (by the grace of God) at varying levels of human experience, waking and sleeping; and it was surely the superimposing of the fable on the story with peculiar grace and fulness that is signified by the angelic greeting to Mary, "Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and power of the Highest shall overshadow thee."

That, however, is rushing our fences. We have perhaps been less than civil to the real Venice, as distinct from the Venice of Canaletto's pictures; the point may be clearer if we think of some quite unimportant thing that has achieved immortality in the same way; Constable's hay-wain, for example. That is a good example of a myth, because there may well have been a real, historic hay-wain which the painter used for his picture—in fact, there must have been—but the question is unimportant beside the picture itself, which is *true in its own right*. That is the acid test of a myth: it may describe something that actually happened or it may describe something that never happened, but is it true in its own right?

Perhaps Venice itself is a kind of myth: the city rising up out of the water—city signifying, as always in mythology, the fulfilling of man's destiny, while the water signifies his unconscious mind (usually the "collective unconscious"). As we have seen, the old bards and myth-makers did not need Jung to teach them symbols, for they found these ready-made. Jung, for example, uses the word "shadow" to describe that part of our psyche that we keep in the background, refusing to admit (even to ourselves, quite frequently) that we possess it. Now there is an old saying (found in varying forms in

[1] *An Autobiography* (1954), ad loc. [2] *New Statesman* (1954), p. 711.

many parts of the world) that the Devil casts no shadow; and, of course, if devils of the traditional sort did exist they would—in the psychologist's sense of the term—possess no shadow, for they are *ex hypothesi* beings incapable of shame.

Again, why do we talk of a "dry old stick" when we mean someone who draws upon the emotions less than we do? Or a "wet", of one in whom the balance has shifted much too far the other way? Surely it is because men *instinctively* equate the emotions, and the unconscious to which the emotions belong, with water? Let us glance briefly at four water myths, three of which are unhistorical, while one is Gospel truth. They are—Psyche at the bath; the birth of Venus; the legend of Laocoön; and the Baptism of our Lord. The first seems to signify that, as Psyche lived on dry land, so the spirit of man must live a life of reason; yet if that life is to be wholesome, it must as constantly turn to the boundless resources of the unconscious as our bodies to the washtub. The legend of Venus arising from the foam at Paphos is quite different; she is not bathing, she is being born from the waters of the unconscious. Botticelli, in his glorious *Birth of Venus*, has surely overlooked one essential of the ancient myth: she rises always, not from tranquil waters but from foam, from troubled waters breaking on the shore. The Venus myth, however, can be taken at widely differing levels of spirituality and carnality; on this the Song of Songs, St Bernard and St John of the Cross are in agreement—not to mention that still to-day, at Old Paphos, the Virgin Mary is supplicated under the name *Panaghia Aphroditessa*.

The Laocoön legend has been given a manufactured Greek meaning (he was being punished by the gods for trying to frustrate the Argive plans). But the myth carries its own grim and all-too-obvious meaning: the waters of the mind are no mere bathing-pool, or seashore lovely with waves breaking in the sunshine. The dark inherited collective unconscious contains such hidden strength as can, like giant serpents, constrict or paralyse the conscious mind, and the activities that spring from its proper working; and in the snake-like grip of these unmeasured forces parents and children can be crushed together.[1] It is the task of the psychiatrist to resolve these tensions, examples of which are common in the pastoral experience of any parish priest—and, of course, in the recorded ministry of our Lord.

To him we now turn, but not in an attempt to interpret the whole symbolism of the Baptism, for even inherently—excluding what we may attach to it for expository purposes—it is too far-reaching. Let us merely notice one or two features that would repay study and meditation, and might lead on to others. Venus came to the world of men from troubled waters, accompanied by many doves (signifying perhaps the diversities of love for which she stands); Jesus came up out of the untroubled water of Jordan (probably, as St John

[1] Two things strike one about statuary in Germany. One is that there are almost no female statues. The other is the frequency of groups depicting a desperate primeval struggle between men and sea-gods. The second of these is perhaps the more significant. Cf. *The Dry Salvages*.

records, at Aenon, the place of fountains, near to Salim, the place of peace), and there was one dove, signifying the unity of love that God offers and ultimately expects. I suggest that our Lord did actually repent at Jordan, in the sense that he took his bearings, even though this did in fact involve no change of direction; and his insistence on baptism with water carries with it the implication that *metanoia* cannot take place purely on dry land, in the mythical sense that it can never be a matter purely of the reason or intellect. A broken mind is the last thing God wants; what he asks for is a broken and contrite heart. Notice, however, that our Lord's handling of the temptations took place, in contrast, in the driest of deserts.

There is something ineffably sublime in the Evangelists' picture of the baptized God coming up out of the water; and I would go so far as to suggest that it is the essence of this that Canaletto has (of course not consciously) transferred to his apocalyptic Venice, the city rising up out of the sea. How different from a lesser-known legend that he may have heard of, about a lakeside sixty miles to the north! The Milstättersee lies over the mountains in Kärnten. There, so they say, when the Christian missionaries came from Maria-Saal, the waters of the lake rose and submerged a thousand heathen statues at a place that still to-day is called Milstat—*mille statuae*. To one who has lived there it is, in the sunlight or on a summer's night, the loveliest of Austria's lakes; but in the dark time of the year there could be few more ominous symbols of the unwisdom of submerging, beneath the waters of the unconscious, the pagan images of which we have grown tired or ashamed.

That, at any rate, is how it struck me—as offering (if one were a poet) first-class material for a poem; for it is of this coinciding of the story and the fable that poetry is made. This is not to say, however, that there is an accepted myth about Milstat; there is the legend of the statues, but for all I know the *myth* suggested above may never have occurred to anybody but myself. This point is important, for the search for genuine myth in the Bible as a whole, and the Gospels in particular, may easily become a mere game in which the players snowball each other with clever ideas that would have astonished the original writers. We must distinguish very clearly between myth, which is objective, and allegorization, which is subjective.

The idea behind allegorization was summed up by Durendus of Mende (*ob.* 1296 A.D.) when he said, "Jerusalem is understood historically of that earthly city to which pilgrims go; allegorically of the Church militant; tropologically of every faithful soul; anagogically of the heavenly Jerusalem that is our country." It seems to me that much of the Psalms, and indeed of the Old Testament, can be of little value to Christians (other than theological specialists) unless interpreted in this way;[1] and of course it was applied to the New Testament also by the great sixteenth-century teachers of mental prayer and by the Oratorians. The objective study of myth in the Bible, on the other hand, must be confined to the *mythische Weltbild* of the ages in which the respective books were written. Careful

[1] Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 131.

study of Mr Robert Graves' erudite works on Mediterranean and Celtic mythology will serve to show how very difficult this objective approach is in a field of scholarship that deals so largely with the borderland between ego and Id, and where the student is peculiarly liable to share in the *participation mystique*[1] of the people whom he studies. Mythology must also (I think) be distinguished from typology, though at times the two overlap. Typology is a method of exegesis which corresponds to Mr Eliot's method of writing poetry, in which a passage has different meanings at different levels. In typology the different levels are different epochs, in which one type repeats itself with (normally) increasing spiritual fulfilment. Deutero-Isaiah, for example, sees the coming deliverance from Exile as a type already enacted in the deliverance from Chaos (Creation) and from Egypt (Exodus); to which Christianity has of course added a fourth layer.

Bultmann draws a difference between an event which is *historisch* (an historic happening pure and simple) and one which is *geschichtlich* (having an existential reference to present life).[2] Without quibbling about the meaning of "existential" we can accept this as a basis for what we mean by myth: a myth must be *geschichtlich*, and it can, but need not, be *historisch*. It differs from a type in conveying a general truth, while a type prefigures some specific future event.

There has been only one Life in which the "story"—if I understand Bultmann correctly—was completely identified with the "fable"; and the four accounts we have of the perennially important parts of it were written with such mastery that every smallest detail is *geschichtlich*. That nothing in the Gospels is merely *historisch* would be generally agreed; but too often such incidents as the Stilling of the Storm are rather vaguely described as "supernatural"—i.e. as indicating (if they are accepted as factual) that the Logos, who made all things, could *a fortiori* influence the working of the material world. This assumption, however—reverent though it may seem—begs a rather large kenotic question; and anyway does not the account take its place much more appropriately in the Gospel if it is read as a (possibly factual) myth signifying that the Son of Man is Lord of the unruly passions of men? So, too, with the Gadarene Swine:[3] if the Milstat myth (above) is taken as illustrating psychological repression, is not the Gadarene story seen as an arresting dramatization of the principle underlying sacramental confession? Again, the mention of a fig-tree in John 1. 48, and the cursing (Mark 11. etc.), are in the one case pointless and in the other slightly distasteful, unless we admit some mythical interpretation—possibly

[1] Primitive people do not differentiate sharply between themselves and their environment; they live in what Lévy-Bruhl calls *participation mystique*, which means that what happens without also happens within, and vice versa. Frankfort, *Before Philosophy* (Pelican), ad loc.

[2] THEOLOGY (1954), p. 212 n.

[3] For modern Muslim pig-magic see *Royal Central Asian Journal* (1954), p. 24 n.

arising from Jer. 24, which would give an obvious point to both passages.

Study of the Gospel myths is not an optional extra for the more woolly minded among us; it is a challenge to sound scholarship—and here we come up against the difference between the Greek method of apprehending truth (on which our own has been based since the Renaissance) and the Hebrew. The Greek *γινώσκω* signifies cognition by seeing; the corresponding Hebrew *yadha'* is cognition by hearing; which means (says Bultmann)[1] that the Greeks thought "scientifically" while the Hebrews thought "existentially". "With the fading of our classical tradition and the lightening of our instinctive Hellenistic bias"—to quote a *Spectator* review—we may at last be near to admitting that the Renaissance attempt to marry the Sibyls to the Prophets was an unfortunate piece of match-making.[2]

J. P. Stevenson, C.F.

A Primitive Christian Harvest Thanksgiving[3]

One of our earliest authorities for any form of primitive Christian polity reflects an interesting custom with regard to thanksgiving for harvest. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which may be assigned with fair confidence to within a few years of 215 A.D., there occurs the following rubric and prayer:[4] (1) As soon as they begin [to gather?] the firstfruits, let everyone hasten to offer them to the bishop, (2) who shall offer them, give thanks, and name the one who brought them, saying, (3) "We give thee thanks, O God, and we offer to thee the firstfruits of the fruits which thou hast given us for our use, nourishing them by thy Word, commanding the earth to bear increase for the enjoyment and nourishment of men and for all beasts. (4) We praise thee, O God, for these things, and for everything with which thou hast benefited us, adorning all creation for us with

[1] *Bible Key Words*—V (A. and C. Black), ad loc.

[2] They are paired in many Italian Renaissance mosaics.

[3] Communication read at a meeting of the Church History Group of the Tyndale Fellowship, 1954.

[4] Cf. E. Hauler, *Didascalia Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina*, I, Leipzig, 1900, pp. 115 f.; G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition*, 1937, pp. 53 ff. The enumeration of "chapters and verses" used here follows that of Dix. The Latin text, as given by Hauler, runs, "Fructus natos primum quam incipiant eos, omnes festinent offerre episcopo. Qui autem offerit benedicat et nominet eum qui optulit, dicens: Gratias tibi agimus, Deus, et offerimus tibi primitivas fructuum quos dedisti nobis ad percipiendum, per verbum tuum enutriens ea, iubens terrae omnes fructus adferre ad laetitiam et nutrimentum hominum et omnibus animalibus. Super his omnibus laudamus te, Deus, et in omnibus quibus nos iuvasti, adornans nobis omnem creaturam variis fructibus per puerum tuum Jesum Christum dominum nostrum, per quem tibi gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

"Benedicuntur quidem fructus, id est uva, ficus, mala grania, oliva, pyrus, malum, sycaminum, persicum, ceraseum, amygdalum, damascena, non pepon, non melopepon, non cucumeres, non cepa, non aleus, nec aliut de aliis oleribus. Sed et aliquotiens et flores offeruntur. Offeratur ergo rosa et lilium et alia vero non. In omnibus autem, quae percipiuntur, sancto Deo gratias agant in gloriam eius percipientes."

manifold produce, (5) through thy son, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom to thee be glory world without end. Amen." (6) Fruits indeed may be blessed, namely the grape, the fig, the pomegranate, the olive, the pear, the apple, the mulberry, the peach, the cherry, the almond, the plum; but not the pumpkin, nor the melon, nor cucumbers, nor the onion, nor the garlic, nor any other vegetable. (7) But flowers also are sometimes offered: the rose and the lily may therefore be offered, and none at all beside. (8) And for everything that is eaten let them give thanks to the holy God, eating to his glory.

The version quoted is from the fourth-to-fifth-century Verona Latin fragments. The Oriental versions in which the substance of *The Apostolic Tradition* has been preserved, Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic, together with two works which have drawn freely upon it, *The Testament of Our Lord* and *The Canons of Hippolytus*, have many variants, particularly in the lists of permissible and prohibited fruits, but they are not of such a nature as need detain us here, for they confirm the general outline of the Latin text. It is even more strikingly confirmed by a Greek version of the prayer in the Byzantine use pointed out by G. Mercati in 1917.[1]

The practice to which Hippolytus refers has several interesting features. First, it is a private act of thanksgiving by the individual member of the Christian congregation. The bishop, indeed, is instructed to mention the worshipper by name in his dedicatory prayer, though the present text of the prayer, being, like the other prayers in this work, only a model, makes no provision for this. (Both Testament and Canons of Hippolytus leave room for an insertion of the offerer's name before the doxology.) In the second place, it is a dedication of the firstfruits, not a thanksgiving for the harvest gathered in. The prayer itself follows the normal pattern of a Jewish *berakhah*: "Blessed be thou, O Lord God, who . . ." The "blessing" referred to is thus a blessing of the name of God and not of the offering itself. It is possible, indeed, that the prayer is based on a Jewish model. The reference to the word perfecting[2] the fruits of creation, to a Jew a natural reflection on Gen. 1, would be filled with new meaning for a Christian who, like Hippolytus, placed emphasis on the work of the Logos in creation.

The custom invites comparison with the Old Testament offering of the firstfruits. The fullest description of this is in Deut. 26. 1–11 (cf. also Ex. 34. 26; Num. 18. 13). Like its Christian counterpart, the offering was a private act of thanksgiving when the worshipper brought the firstfruits of his crop to God.

When settled in his new inheritance, the Israelite was to take some of the firstfruits of all his crops and bring it in a basket to the sanctuary. Before the priest he then declared that he had come to the

[1] *Alcuni scritti e brevi saggi di studii sulla Volgata*, Rome, 1917. The prayer is printed in Goar, *Euchologion*[2], Venice, 1730, p. 522. A restoration of the *Apostolic Tradition* text of this prayer was attempted by Dom R. H. Connolly, "An Ancient Prayer in the Mediaeval Euchologia," *J.T.S.*, xix, 1918, pp. 132–7.

[2] So the Greek, τελεσφορήσας, supported by Coptic, Arabic, Testament. Latin has *enutriens*.

land which God had sworn to the patriarchs to give them. When the priest had set the basket down before the altar the Israelite was to make a new declaration before God, recalling the humble origins of the nation, how it had prospered in Egypt and then been brought to servitude and distress: how the Israelites had cried in anguish to Jehovah; how he had heard, and, in demonstration of his mighty power, brought them out of Egypt and into the new land, flowing with milk and honey, which he had given them. The worshipper then presented to God what he had first given to him, worshipped, and rejoiced in all God's goodness to him, his family and dependents.

The Old Testament offering of firstfruits is thus not only a thanksgiving for the blessings of creation but a solemn remembrance of the work of redemption. It looks back to the promise to Abraham, the enslavement in Egypt, and the deliverance from bondage, and the fulfilment of all God's promises in the promised land. It is essentially a ceremony to be rendered "when thou art come in unto the land".

The work of redemption is much less prominent in Hippolytus' account of the Christian *berakhah* than it is in the Old Testament worshipper's confession. But the remembrance of redemption as an essential part of the offering of the firstfruits may help to explain one otherwise very obscure point in the rubric.

The lists of permitted and prohibited products vary in all the versions, but they all conform to one pattern: fruits are permitted, vegetables are forbidden. There is no mention of farinacious foods, probably because Hippolytus was not writing for a farming community but for urban Christians with only small crops. Dr B. S. Easton says, "The reasons for the distinctions . . . are probably irrecoverable, but vegetables of the gourd family were favoured food among ascetics of the gnostic type."[1] This is a very long shot: and besides, in view of the fondness for symbol, particularly of natural produce in the context of divine worship,[2] which *Apostolic Tradition* evidences, it would be strange if such a precise distinction had no further significance.

What is striking about the list of vegetables specifically mentioned is its resemblance to that in Num. 11. 5. In the midst of the wilderness journey the Israelites complain, "Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt for nought; the cucumbers and the melons and the leeks and the onions and the garlick" (LXX *τοὺς σικύας καὶ τοὺς πέπονας καὶ τὰ πράσα καὶ τὰ κρόμμυα καὶ τὰ σκόρδα*). May it not be, then, that the original point of the distinction, however much it may have been overlaid in our versions, was between the fruits of the promised land and the vegetables of the land of Egypt? The redemption of Israel, and so, typically, of the Christian, was thus commemorated. The Christian had "come in unto the land" where God's promises are seen to be fulfilled, and his offering, like that of the Israelite of old, showed it forth.[3]

[1] *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, Cambridge, 1934, p. 102.

[2] Cf. *Ap. Trad.*, v (Berakhah over oil); *Ap. Trad.*, vi (Berakhah over cheese and olives); *Ap. Trad.*, xxiii, 2 (milk and honey at first communion).

[3] In the passage already referred to, on the administering of milk and honey

The fact that the rose and the lily alone of flowers were offered in this thanksgiving is also, doubtless, symbolic. Easton is probably right when he assigns the privileged status of rose and lily to Cant. ii, 1.[1] They were Messianic symbols;[2] and seem to have had a deep meaning for the early Christians under fire. Thus Cyprian can say that the Church is bedecked with both the lily and the rose, because it has been white with good works and then empurpled with the blood of the martyrs.[3]

Nothing is said of the ultimate destination of the produce. In the Old Testament the firstfruits were given to God and given by him to his ministers (Num. 18. 8–13; cf. Ezek. 44. 30). This Old Testament principle, that the firstfruits belong to God, is reflected in the *Didache*: for there, firstfruits are to be given to the prophet, but, if there is none present, to the poor.[4] The writer of the "Little Labyrinth" (just possibly Hippolytus himself) is angry with the "shameful covetousness" of Natalius, the Theodotian bishop, who had the audacity to receive a fixed salary in money.[5] It is probable that for Hippolytus, too, the firstfruits were a regular part of the bishop's income.[6] The reference in sentence 8 to eating with thanks would be to the part of the crop not offered but consumed at home.

If these suggestions be sound, the earliest form of the Christian harvest festival would seem to have been an offering of firstfruits which reflected Old Testament practice and took it further: the Christian, like the pious Israelite, coupled his prayer of thanksgiving for all the blessings of this life with the knowledge that he was one of a redeemed people. The Israelite gave thanks from the context of the promised land. The Christian, too, was in his promised land: he was "in Christ".

A. F. Walls.

---

at first communion, a practice well attested elsewhere, Hippolytus states explicitly that this represents the fulfilment of the promise made to the patriarchs, *qua(m) dixit terram fluentem lac et mel, quam et dedit carnem suam Christus.* The promised land is the flesh of Christ, nourishment for the believer, *in suavitate verbi amara cordis dulcia efficiens.*

[1] Loc cit.

[2] Cf. Hippolytus In Cant., ii, 1: "'Ich bin eine Blume der Felder' und 'die Lilie des Thales'. Weil David sagt, 'Deine Felder werden fruchtbar. . . .' Das sind die Völker der Kirchen zwischen denen Christus wie eine Blume ist" (Hippolytus, *G.C.S.*, I, p. 363).

[3] *Ep.*, x, 3.

[4] *Didache*, xiii.

[5] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, V, 28, 8 ff.

[6] I am grateful to the Editor for calling my attention to a very relevant passage in the Syriac *Didascalia* VIII (R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Oxford, 1929, pp. 78–84). By common consent this is a third-century work of orthodox theology and Syro-Palestinian provenance. The passage exhorts bishops to discharge faithfully their duty of stewardship of the revenues of the Church, both feeding the poor and needy from them and themselves being "nourished from the Church". It is specifically said that they are to be like the Levites, who "were nourished from those things which were given as offerings to God by all the people—gifts, and part-offerings, and firstfruits, and tithes, and sacrifices, and offerings, and holocausts".

The Burning Fiery Furnace

As we read the early chapters of the Book of Daniel we are impressed by the remarkable faith of Daniel and his companions, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, or, as they were known in Babylon, of Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Daniel in the lion's den and the three holy children in the burning fiery furnace are for us shining examples of those who through faith stopped the mouths of lions and quenched the violence of fire. Through them God showed the truth of his promise, "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned" (Isa. 43. 2); and to Daniel came the answer to the Psalmist's prayer, "Save me from the lion's mouth" (Ps. 22. 21).

But again, when we are told that this book was not written by Daniel, a captive in Babylon, but some three or four centuries later in the time of the Maccabees, we cannot help wondering if these stories are really true or if they are not simply pious fiction.

The purpose of this essay is to examine one of these stories in order to show that, though in its present form there is much that is inaccurate, it may, nevertheless, be derived from an authentic historical occurrence. It is, of course, beyond my scope and purpose to consider certain features of the story, namely the miraculous element and the fact of the faith of the principal actors in it. There may well be a certain amount of exaggeration or magnification of the miraculous which has crept in in the process of telling the story, but to remove this *exaggeration* does not necessarily destroy the *miracle*, and may serve to show even more clearly that the story is in fact fundamentally reasonable.

Oriental potentates have never been famous for the kindness which they displayed towards those who offended against them, and King Nebuchadnezzar seems to have been no exception to this rule when he ordered Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego to be cast into the burning fiery furnace. But what seems peculiar in his treatment of these men is that for them the furnace, which had been prepared, according to the present version of the story, for those who disobeyed, should have been heated seven times hotter. It is, of course, possible that "seven times" is not to be taken literally, as meaning that the temperature was to be raised from say 2,000° to 14,000°, but only means very much hotter. Presumably other victims, though none are mentioned, were to be burnt at the normal temperature, while the three holy children were to be burnt at a much greater heat.

It appears from the story that this was to be the greater punishment. But a slow fire would be a more painful means of torment than an exceedingly hot one, since the victim would suffer considerable agony before death or unconsciousness overcame him, while in a very hot fire death would be almost instantaneous.

Moreover, we may ask, how would it be possible, assuming the fire in the first instance to be a fairly hot one, even with extra fuel to raise the temperature to such a degree in a furnace whose interior was visible to a bystander?

And again, why should this treatment be reserved only for these particular victims? Further, according to the present version of the story, the fire was already alight for the destruction of the disobedient. A tyrant generally expects the threat of dire punishment to discourage disobedience, and we cannot help but be surprised at the apparent assumption on the part of Nebuchadnezzar that his order would not be carried out universally. If indeed this were so he would not, perhaps, have been so much moved by the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. In any case, it is hardly usual to kindle the fire at the stake before the heresy has been discovered.

These considerations, quite apart from the miraculous escape of Daniel's compatriots, with which we are not here concerned, may make us doubt the accuracy of the narrative in the Book of Daniel. And, moreover, these doubts must exist whether this book is the work of a writer in the fifth or second century before Christ.

From what has been said above, it would appear that there are two possible conclusions: either that the story is a complete fabrication, or that the account as it stands in Daniel represents a late version of what actually took place and that the inaccuracies in it are due to a misunderstanding of the facts. For the later the work the greater is the opportunity for variations and misunderstandings to creep in, and the greater, therefore, the possibility that the story goes back to an actual historical event. If it is simply fiction, there is then nothing more to be said; but if not, then we may perhaps ask what may the true account be, and to discover this let us begin by considering the apparent nature of the burning fiery furnace.

If it was possible for Nebuchadnezzar to observe Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the midst of the fire (Dan. 3. 25), it would appear that the furnace must have been in the form of an open fire of some sort rather than an enclosed fire like a kiln. Nor was it a pyre to be ignited when the victims were already on it, since the fire was alight even before they were bound preparatory to being burnt (verses 19–21). The order to heat the furnace seven times more than it was wont to be heated seems to presuppose that the fire was already alight, and kept burning. Again, for this extra heating to have been achieved the existing fire must have been of a comparatively low temperature, since it would be impossible to increase the heat of a really hot open fire to such a degree, even with the addition of such fuel as was available (cf. Song of the Three Children, v. 23).

From these observations it would seem that the furnace, into which Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were cast, consisted of an open fire, perhaps in a trench or depression in the ground, which had been at first of a fairly low temperature but capable of being raised by the addition of extra fuel. It was thus different from the fire round the martyr's stake, or the pyre upon which Cyrus is reputed to have attempted to burn Croesus or on which Dido, Queen of Carthage, ended her life. The type of fire would seem, therefore, to have been similar to that used by modern Indian fire-walkers.

The suggestion which I now intend to make, and which I hope to substantiate in the rest of this essay, is that this is precisely what the

furnace was intended for by King Nebuchadnezzar—namely, ritual fire-walking—and that the present version of the story of the three holy children is to be traced back to an account in which the king ordered his subjects to worship the golden image by such fire-walking.

To justify such a theory it is necessary, first, to show that such a form of worship was in fact current at the time when, and in the place where, this is supposed to have occurred; and, secondly, to show that it was not likely to have been simply burning as a punishment.

Frazer, in *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris,* has given many examples of this kind of worship and accounted for its origin. A few quotations will be sufficient for our present purpose. Writing on the ritual of the death and resurrection of the god, and in particular on the worship of Melcarth or Moloch, he has put forward the theory, with a wealth of corroborative evidence, that many kings claimed to be divine and were accepted as such, and that the privilege—and penalty—of such divinity was, at one time, to be offered as a human sacrifice. Thus, he says, "We have seen reason to think that the Kings of Tyre, from whom Dido was descended, claimed to personate the god Melcarth, and that the deity was burned either in effigy or in the person of a man at an annual festival. Now in the same chapter in which Ezekiel charges the King of Tyre with claiming to be a god, the prophet describes him as walking 'up and down amidst the stones of fire'. The description becomes at once intelligible if we suppose that in later times the King of Tyre compounded for being burnt in the fire by walking up and down on hot stones, thereby saving his life at the expense perhaps of a few blisters on his feet. It is possible that when all went well with the commonwealth, children whom strict law doomed to the furnace of Moloch may also have been mercifully allowed to escape on condition of running the fiery gauntlet. At all events, a religious rite of this sort has been and is still practised in many parts of the world: the performers solemnly pace through a furnace of heated stones or glowing wood-ashes in the presence of a multitude of spectators. Examples of the custom could be multiplied. Here I will cite only one. At Castabala, in southern Cappadocia, there was worshipped an Asiatic goddess whom the Greeks called the Perasian Artemis. Her priestesses used to walk barefoot over a fire of charcoal without sustaining any injury" (*Adonis, Attis, and Osiris,* p. 38).

Frazer also points out that these priestesses were insensible to pain because, as it was believed, they were inspired by the goddess (p. 85); he does not say how this inspiration was produced.

We may also notice that this form of worship is apparently alluded to in Holy Scripture. Apart from the reference in Ezekiel alluded to by Frazer, we may note that both Ahaz and Manasseh, among the Kings of Judah who introduced heathen practices into Jerusalem, caused their sons "to pass through the fire" (2 Kings 16. 3 and 21. 6), while the same was done generally by the people of Israel who "left all the commandments of the Lord their God . . . and worshipped Baal" (2 Kings 17. 16–17). If this was in fact fire-walking and not

simply a periphrasis for human sacrifice, it was later understood to mean human sacrifice. Thus the chronicler states that Ahaz "burnt his children in the fire" (2 Chron. 28. 3). When this practice was forbidden in the time of Josiah we read the command in Deuteronomy, "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire" (Deut. 18. 10). This seems to refer to fire-walking rather than actual sacrifice, for the latter is referred to specifically as burning their sons and their daughters in the fire (12. 31). It would seem strange to use two such different expressions for the same thing.

To return, however, to the story in Daniel. We are told (3. 5) that the worship of the golden image was to take place when the people heard "the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music". Now we have seen how certain fire-walkers did so in a state of ecstatic inspiration; and what is more natural than that in this case this ecstasy should have been induced by the strains of this barbaric orchestra? In a similar way, with the aid of such musical instruments, do dervishes work themselves into such a pitch of frenzy that they become insensible to the pains they inflict upon themselves.

If such a theory as I have suggested is in fact true, then the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego and the fiery furnace may be reconstructed on some such lines as these.

King Nebuchadnezzar, instead of himself being burnt alive, as Frazer has suggested may have been the fate of divine kings in even more savage times, erected the golden image of his god, and before it, to the accompaniment of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, trod through the pit of fire; and ordered—or allowed—his subjects to do the same, which doubtless many did gladly, since the fire would not be excessively hot, and, under the influence of the chanting and the music, they would be in a kind of ecstasy. It is not difficult to imagine the scene: the golden image towering above the smouldering embers; the intoxicating sounds of stringed and wind instruments; the worshippers gradually becoming more and more frenzied and casting themselves one after the other into the fiery furnace in homage to their god, and to emerge again purified and raised to a new life. And not far away there stand three Jews, watching the idolatrous performance with feelings, no doubt, of sorrow and loathing.

The fate of these three men may perhaps be explained thus. As believers only in the God of heaven, the Lord Jehovah, they refused to conform to this worshipping of idols. But they were compelled to do so; or rather their fire-walk was to be an actual sacrifice. With the fire's heat increased considerably by the addition of pitch, naphtha, and brushwood, so that the glowing charcoal became a raging inferno, the three companions were cast in, as a means not so much of punishment as of making amends to the god for any insult implied by their refusal. And, indeed, for this sacrifice to be accomplished, the fire would have to be built up a good deal and the temperature so raised to ensure the destruction of their bodies

before the fire died away. Perhaps if there were any recalcitrant Babylonians, they would be compelled merely to pass through the fire in the same way as willing worshippers, while the supreme penalty was exacted only from these blasphemous Jews.

The author of Daniel seems to regard Nebuchadnezzar's treatment of the three holy children as being a punishment. But if the suggestions made above are correct, this can hardly be the case. It would seem that there is a more intimate connexion between the worship of the golden image and the so-called fiery furnace than appears in our present record. To a Jew of the second century before Christ, who may not have been familiar with such forms of worship as I have suggested took place in the plain of Dura, and may perhaps have once taken place in Jerusalem itself, the pit of fire would quite naturally be assumed to be a form of punishment. By the time Daniel came to be written the original significance of the action of Ahaz and Manasseh, who made their sons pass through the fire to Moloch, had no doubt been forgotten, being regarded as a form of human sacrifice. In earlier days this ritual fire-walking had been condemned in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings 23. 10), and seems never to have formed a part of the worship of Jehovah. Indeed the fires of Moloch in the valley of Hinnom, far from being held sacred by the orthodox Jew, were intentionally desecrated and polluted and became the type of the fires of Hell itself.

To execute criminals on a sacred altar simply as a means of effecting their punishment would have been unthinkable blasphemy on the part of an adherent of Moloch or Baal, to whom the fire, through which he walked on great occasions to the honour of his god, was held to be sacred. It is for this reason that I have suggested that Nebuchadnezzar's order to burn Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the fiery furnace was not, properly speaking, a punishment: to destroy sinners in the sacred fire would have been a defilement of that fire. It is true that condemned criminals were on occasion offered as human sacrifices, but we are not to suppose in such cases that this was simply a convenient way of inflicting the death penalty. In any case, it would appear that the execution of an offender was originally intended as a kind of propitiatory sacrifice. However, whether it was a sacrifice or a punishment may seem to some to be a distinction without a difference, and in any event it does not materially affect the main argument.

In conclusion it remains only to consider what effect this may have on our evaluation of the Book of Daniel. Briefly I think it is this: Daniel, it is now generally agreed, is the work of a pseudonymous author of the second century before Christ, and therefore little credence is commonly given to the stories of Daniel and his companions in the early chapters. They are regarded by some as being no more than fiction: that indeed they may only be, but I would submit that the suggestions I have made above make the story of the three holy children and the burning fiery furnace more plausible, though it is still a miracle; and that, even though there may be historical inaccuracies in our present record, this is not the kind of story

that would have been invented simply, as it were, "out of the blue", and that, therefore, we have more justification for thinking that it may be traced back to an actual historical event.

B. G. Sanders.

Letter from Ireland

No one has ever explained the curious historical fact that the diocese of Meath—the premier diocese of the Church of Ireland—has never in its long history had a cathedral or chapter. Last St Patrick's Day, St Patrick's Church, Trim, was raised to the rank and status of a cathedral at a hallowing service at which the preacher was the Archbishop of Armagh. At this service the members of the new chapter were installed. The dean will be known by the title Dean of Clonmacnoise, the name of an ancient diocese united to Meath four hundred years ago.

"It would be hard", said Archbishop Gregg in the course of his sermon, "to find a territorial area richer in ecclesiastical associations than that forming the kingdom of Meath and equally the diocese of Meath. When one considers the vast range of the activities of the Celtic missionaries of the seventh and eighth centuries, not only in the British Isles (particularly in Northumbria), but also in France and Switzerland, and even Italy, it would not be a serious exaggeration to speak of Meath as the earliest cradle of those men of God." Iona and Lindisfarne and Bangor and St Gall and Bobbio all look back to this middle region of Ireland, said His Grace, and he added: "Truly, Christianity in the West lies under a deep obligation to the Church of Meath."

This extended reference to a notable domestic event in the life of the Church of Ireland will perhaps be pardoned because, I think, it is a symbol of the brave resolve of the Church in Southern Ireland, where there has been a woeful decline in numbers, not to surrender tamely all that its long history has taught, but to go forward in the faith that God has still some great work for her to do in Ireland.

The problems confronting the Church of Ireland differ north and south. "Construction in the north, consolidation in the south," said the Bishop of Limerick, Dr E. C. Hodges, at the meeting of his diocesan synods in June. In the north, rapid strides are being made to supply new churches and church halls in the crowded areas in and around Belfast. In this work notable service has been rendered by the Bishops of Connor and of Down, who have more than once aroused the sympathetic interest of the whole Church and who have both obtained from the central funds of the Church substantial grants and also raised considerable sums within their respective dioceses.

Fifty years ago Bishop Welland consecrated the nave of St Anne's Cathedral, Belfast. When the cathedral is completed it will indeed be a noble building, and the whole Church rejoices that immediate steps have been taken to complete the sanctuary and east end of the church. Incidentally, when completed the logical position of the

celebrant at the Holy Communion will be the westward position. This can be allowed only by fresh legislation which might have far-reaching and constructive effect on our liturgical practice. Mention may be made here, too, of the notable reconstruction and repair which is going on in the north, especially in the cathedrals at Armagh and Downpatrick.

"Consolidation in the south." In the north of Ireland the Church of Ireland represents rather less than one-third of the total population, and it is a growing community. In the south it now numbers about 140,000, that is to say rather less than five per cent. of the total population of the Republic. To have kept the parochial system alive in every part of the country, even in the remote areas of the south and west, is no mean achievement. Still, a new technique is needed if the lives of the country clergy are to be made bearable. Probably loneliness and spiritual isolation bear more heavily on the average parish priest in Southern Ireland than in any other part of the Anglican Communion. Courage and capacity are tested to the uttermost and there is no more admirable body in all Christendom. I can write this with a perfect sincerity for I know most of the clergy personally, many of the younger ones having passed through the Divinity School in Trinity College, since I joined its staff, and recently I have visited many parishes in order to give lectures on the Anglican Congress and the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches. Still the situation in the south of Ireland calls for dedicated statesmanship, and it is good to know that the whole matter is under constant review by the House of Bishops.

The shortage of candidates for the ministry seriously troubles the Church here as it does in England. Furthermore, there is a leakage to England and to the Church overseas of too high a proportion of unusually able men. Twice recently a pastoral letter from the archbishops and bishops has been read in all the churches. Normally the bishops require an ordinand to be a graduate and to have the Divinity Testimonium of Trinity College or else some similar qualification. In recent years a limited number of senior men, not graduates, have taken a Diploma of Biblical Studies in Dublin University and have been accepted for ordination. This is a reasonable move but obviously one to be watched with "a jealous eye", for the Irish Church has a tradition that its ministry is an educated ministry and therefore inevitably this move must be regarded as a passing one.

The retirement from the Bench of Bishops of Dr W. S. Kerr, Bishop of Down and Dromore, is regretted both in the north, where his whole ministry has been spent, and in the south, of which he is a native. Inevitably we must be prepared for great changes in the near future, since of the fourteen bishops no less than eight have reached the age of seventy-four or more. The whole Church rejoices that it still has the privilege of being led by one of the greatest bishops in her history, Archbishop Gregg of Armagh, who this year completes forty years of service as a bishop in the Church of God.

R. R. Hartford.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. P. Stevenson is Rector of Rockingham, Western Australia.

The Rev. A. F. Walls is Secretary and Librarian of Tyndale House, Cambridge. His article is based on a paper read to the Church History Group of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research.

The Rev. B. G. Sanders is Rector of Hamerton, Huntingdon.

Dr Hartford is Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, and a Canon of St Patrick's Cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE

"BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION TO-DAY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In the course of your Editorial giving an appraisal of the Majority and Minority Schedules attached to the Reports *Baptism and Confirmation To-day*, which is a model of fairness, you unfortunately make two statements likely to create a mistaken impression. The Minority did not consist of three members out of a total of twenty-nine in the sense that the twenty-nine comprised a single body. There were two separate Joint Committees, one of the Convocation of Canterbury, the other of the Convocation of York. These Committees did in fact sit together, but that they were distinct bodies is shown by their having terms of reference which, though similar, were not identical. It would therefore be more accurate to speak of the body of which the three were a minority as consisting of seventeen.

Secondly, to speak of "generous treatment" of the Minority and "the extension of so much indulgence" appears to ignore the existence of a custom by which any minority of any Convocation Committee has a constitutional right to present a report to its own Convocation. This right was recognized by the Standing Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury in this instance, as it has been, even when a single member has presented a Minority Report. It therefore seems hardly appropriate to speak of "generosity" and "indulgence" in this connexion.

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
TREVOR JALLAND.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
EXETER.
22 June 1955.

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

On p. 265 of the July issue of THEOLOGY the Rev. G. F. S. Gray writes, in the course of a discussion of "Jehovah's Witnesses", that "the doctrine of everlasting punishment is not now held by any

of the bigger Christian Communions". May I respectfully ask his authority for this statement? The Anglican Prayer Book certainly appears to teach, both implicitly and explicitly, the doctrine in question, and I should be most surprised to hear that the Church of Rome had abandoned it. It occurs to me that I may have misunderstood Mr Gray, who is perhaps drawing a distinction between "eternal" and "everlasting" punishment: but I think his statement as it stands is confusing.

Yours truly,
S. J. Bailey.

Cavick House,
Wymondham.

A QUOTATION FROM ST AUGUSTINE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The recent Report entitled *The Church and the Law of Nullity of Marriage* (S.P.C.K., 1955) has a footnote on p. 10 to the sentence: "St Augustine says that a sacrament is a holy sign." The footnote runs as follows: St Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 10. 5: "Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum, est." ("A sacrifice therefore is the visible sacrament or sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice.")

The translation agrees with that of Hitchcock (*St Augustine's Treatise on the City of God*, S.P.C.K., 1951, p. 53), but it does not convey St Augustine's meaning. He has previously been speaking of such sacrifices as martyrdom and religious love and zeal. He writes: "To him (*sc.* God) we sacrifice the host (hostia) of humility and praise on the altar of the heart." And he continues: "The fathers of old time, indeed, offered animal sacrifices to God, which God's people read of but no longer do, for those sacrifices only signified the things which are done in us" (i.e. the interior sacrifices mentioned before). . . . "*The visible sacrifice therefore is a sacrament, that is a holy sign, of the invisible sacrifice.*" This rendering is confirmed by St Augustine's quotation of Ps. 51. 16, 17, with his comment: "The sacrifice, therefore, that God does not demand, i.e. the slain beast, is merely the symbol of the sacrifice which he does demand, i.e. the sorrowing heart." He is not speaking of a Christian sacrament at all. He is using the word simply in the sense of "symbol". The rhythm of the Latin also makes this translation the more natural one.

My criticism does not affect the argument of the Report. It merely makes the introduction of St Augustine's statement at this point irrelevant to the Catechism definition of a sacrament which immediately follows. Matrimony is indeed a sacrament in St Augustine's sense (*v.* p. 8 of the Report on Eph. 5. 32), if not in the limited Catechism sense.

P.O. Box 237,
Dar es Salaam,
Tanganyika.

Yours faithfully,
R. T. Jourdain.

[*The Church and the Law of Nullity of Marriage* will be reviewed in due course.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT TIMES WITH AN INTRODUCTION TO THE APOCRYPHA. By Robert H. Pfeiffer. A. and C. Black. 25s.

The formative period of Jewish thought which immediately preceded the coming of Christ is always something of a puzzle to theological students, both on account of its complexity and because much of it still remains obscure. This sequel to the author's *Introduction to the Old Testament* admirably meets this need, and is likely to become a generally accepted textbook. It is because there are so few books on the subject readily available that it came to be written out of the author's long teaching experience. This explains why it is primarily informative in character, summarizing the work of many scholars; and he is less concerned to put forward his own theories than in his former volume. Very full bibliographies testify to the massive reading on which it is based. Unfortunately these have not been brought up to date since the book was published in America five years ago.

The main title is misleading, for though the history extends from about 300 B.C. to A.D. 100, the New Testament and Christian origins are left out of the discussion as far as possible. Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism are rightly treated separately. This shows clearly how the same elements developed in different ways. In Palestine there is a natural casuistic development of the Law in Halakah and Haggadah, so as to make it applicable to every circumstance of life. On the other hand, in the Diaspora there is a tendency to keep the written law to the minimum imposed by the Pentateuch, so as to avoid too great a clash with the ways of the Hellenistic peoples. To understand Hellenistic Judaism it is necessary to understand Hellenistic Greek thought. There is a magnificent survey of this in a long chapter. But the systematic and encyclopedic approach has the disadvantage of allowing the reader to lose sight of the real contacts with Judaism; and the whole subject would have gained considerably in usefulness if the author had overcome his scruples and given some indication of how far it constitutes a "praeparatio evangelica".

The second part gives a summary of each book of the Apocrypha and full discussion of all important questions. For some reason 2 (4) Esdras is omitted, being placed in the first part, where the scope of the work necessarily curtails discussion, and the Christian portions of the book are not considered at all. It thus takes its place as one of the Pseudepigrapha. The line of division is, of course, purely artificial, and it might have been well to have treated all the books of the Apocrypha in their historical sequence in this way. Certainly much repetition would have been avoided.

A few points call for comment. The classification of literature by place and race of origin has led the author to underestimate the "international" character of the Wisdom Literature (to use Bentzen's expression). There is thus no real problem when a Persian folktale is found in the Alexandrian-Jewish writings as the basis of a collection of aphorisms, whether it be Ahikar in Tobit or The Three Youths in 1 Esdras.

Theological students will be disappointed that Professor Pfeiffer has refused to face the real issue for religion raised by the personification of Wisdom in Wis. 7. 22—8. 1, though he has much to say on this passage which is of interest.

Acrostics in Pss. 2 and 110, proving Maccabaean date, are referred to several times, always with greater assurance. Yet the very ingenious one claimed for Ps. 2 need be no more than coincidence (like the cryptograms in Shakespeare claimed by the Baconians), and Bickell's suggestion that Ps. 110 contains the name Shim'ōn has not been generally accepted. Both leave some verses unaccounted for.

Among many interpretations of the story of Susanna, it is surprising that none is based on the figurative identity of adultery and idolatry. This is a recurring theme in the Old Testament and reappears in the Apocalypse. If it is tenable in this case, it gives the story a symbolic purpose in line with the whole motive and outlook of Daniel, and explains how it came to be included in the Greek recension of it.

These are small things to lay against the vast accumulation of accurate information. This compels our gratitude and ensures that this book will remain an indispensable guide for many years to come.

CAMBRIDGE. BARNABAS LINDARS, S.S.F.

THE JUNG CODEX. Three Studies by H. C. Puech, G. Quispel and W. C. van Unnik. Translated and edited by F. L. Cross. Mowbrays. 15s.

For every ten people who have heard of the Hebrew scrolls found at Qumran, probably only one has heard of the Gnostic library found at Nag Hammadi in 1945. Yet one day the latter discovery may seen more important than the former. These three studies of the Jung Codex, one of thirteen to escape repose in the Coptic Museum at Cairo, will add enormously to our knowledge of a most important find; hitherto one had had to rely on some of the items mentioned in the bibliography on pp. 130 f. of this book, and on two contributions which deserved but found no mention there, one by V. R. Gold in the *Biblical Archaeologist*, xv, 4, 1952, 70–88, and the other by W. Foerster in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1954, 6, 377 ff.

There is a certain amount of repetition in the book, which is perhaps inevitable. The contents of the Codex are noted differently by two different scholars on pp. 19 and 45. The influence of Homer, *Il.*, xxii, 199–201, on a passage in the *Gospel of Truth* appears twice, on pp. 31 and 52. And the three scholars assess the gains likely to accrue from the discovery in different places. But apart from that and perhaps a tendency in the first essay to adopt the psychological language of Jung, in whose honour the Codex was named, as on p. 29 and p. 33, one can have nothing but praise for these three studies, pointing as they do to new sources of knowledge about Gnosticism, including texts like the *Gospel of Truth* written by Gnostics themselves. It is no exaggeration to say that when the whole

collection is available, our knowledge of Gnosticism will be put on an entirely new footing. We may have in the *Gospel of Truth*, as van Unnik shows to be extremely probable, an early work of Valentinus himself! While the Church was led towards, if not into, all truth, the Gnostics were led to deny the importance of history and the value of the Christian hope of the Parousia, the entire Old Testament basis of the Christian dispensation, and the New Testament ethical code.

Many positions taken up in the past will have to be re-examined in the light of these discoveries. It may need to be recognized in future that the "mystical" beliefs of St Paul, his themes of death in life and of the resurrection-life with Christ, were widely held in the early part of the second century (pp. 54 f. with the quotation from the *Letter to Rheginos*); or that the Valentinians made their starting-point the Resurrection of Christ; or that the problem posed by Reitzenstein and Bultmann about the doctrine of a pre-Christian Gnostic Redeemer need no longer vex us (pp. 76 f.); that even in pre-Christian times the Name of God was considered as a cosmological principle (p. 70); or that the Canon of the New Testament did not develop "in a straight line" (pp. 123 ff.). With regard to the last point, van Unnik may be right in saying, "It is clear that the writer of the *Gospel of Truth*", Valentinus, as he believes, "was acquainted with the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews and Revelation, while there are traces of Acts, 1 John and 1 Peter." Yet the distinction between the use of Scripture by heretics and that by orthodox may, despite van Unnik, need to be preserved, as a recent set of popular Bampton Lectures would imply. But above all it will be for the light on the origins of Gnosticism that this discovery will be valued, especially if Quispel is right in maintaining that it was from Christianity that the conception of redemption and the figure of the Redeemer was taken over into Gnosticism and that, in so far as Gnosis is pre-Christian, it goes back to heterodox Jewish conceptions; that in its origins Gnosis is "Jewish-Near-Eastern occultism, Oriental mysticism".

C. S. C. Williams.

Merton College,
Oxford.

Ancient Christian Writers. Vols. XVIII, XIX, and XX. Longmans. 25s. each.

Vol. XVIII contains Nyssen's five sermons on the Lord's Prayer and eight on the Beatitudes, Englished for the first time by Miss H. C. Graef, on the staff of the Oxford Lexicon of Patristic Greek. The sermons are worth translating for piquant qualities of Nyssen's thought which Miss Graef has rendered in lively English. Here and there she has gone rather far—p. 47, allegorism accused of "wangling the words"; p. 64, the epicure's taste for "wizard flavourings". But the volume deserves a warm welcome.

Vol. XIX is Origen, *On Prayer* and *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, by Prof. J. J. O'Meara of University College, Dublin; 1954 saw both

these works of Origen appear in English for the first time, but not only in this volume. It is strange that whereas the sole MS of the work *On Prayer* has lain at Trinity College, Cambridge, since 1682, and the *editio princeps* appeared from Oxford in 1692, it should never be Englished till 1954, and then by three people simultaneously. Beside the version under review, Dr E. G. Jay's S.P.C.K. volume and Prof. J. E. L. Oulton's translation in Vol. II of the *Library of Christian Classics* reached the public almost in the same month. The last-mentioned volume also contained a translation of the *Exhortation to Martyrdom* by Mr Henry Chadwick. It would be no waste of money to buy all three books, which are marked by individuality. These two works of Origen would now make an ideal subject for the Evans Prize at Cambridge. A candidate who sat down with Koetschau's text and these three commented versions would profit greatly.

The works in question reveal Origen in his most earnest mood, and lay bare how deeply heretical he is. His notions of prayer are Neo-Platonist, naked and (save for a flimsy cover of allegorical exegesis into which, and not from which, his Neo-Platonism expresses itself) unashamed. The prospect of martyrdom, however, calls the Christian in Origen to support the Platonist, only that he still cannot quite stomach Christ's agony in the garden or let go of the four cardinal virtues.

Prof. O'Meara is sparing in his notes for the non-scholar, whom he seems to leave to draw what edification he can from a readable version. For the more studious he supplies valuable references, with which Origen's true meaning can be pursued. They might run more to works in English. There are more English readers who could profit by W. Metcalfe's S.P.C.K. version of Gregory's *Panegyric* than by Koetschau's *Dankrede*. Nevertheless, we receive a very worthy volume in this translation of Origen.

Vol. XX bears on its title page the name of Dr J. N. D. Kelly, Principal of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, whose recent *Early Christian Creeds* has signally proved his competence to give us a commented version of Rufinus' *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed*; this is, of course, no case of an English version for the first time. Besides those mentioned in the Bibliographical Note, there were C. Whitaker's (George Bell, 1908) and Heurtley's (Parker, 1886). Dr Kelly's notes show his thorough mastery of the patristic literature relevant to his subject, and an excellent judgment in providing the general reader at every point with just the information that he needs.

A special interest of this volume is that it fulfils the claim of the Roman Catholic editors that "their choice is not confined to members of the Catholic Church". But their hand is plain to see in Dr Kelly's volume; as on p. 109, where the claims of Baruch to be Scripture "were finally vindicated at the Council of Trent", or on p. 123, where "it is the teaching of the Catholic Church" that "the second Person of the Holy Trinity placed His own words in the prophet's mouth" (Isa. 50. 6). It may be due to the editors that no interest is anywhere expressed in doctrine that the Roman Church

rejects. Where, again, on p. 115, we come on something of rather Anglican flavour, "In the evangelist's mind, however, 'Holy Spirit' and 'the power of the Most High' undoubtedly stood for the same divine reality", it is promptly neutralized by adding, "viz. the third Person of the Godhead"; an interesting essay in collaboration. Prof. O'Meara escapes with less editorial vigilance, and has been let (p. 7) number Erasmus among "truly great men in the Church" (through quoting Bigg).

In conclusion, we may be allowed to take for special consideration two credal points raised by Dr Kelly. On the Descent to Hades he repeats his suggestion that as a credal clause it may be of Syrian origin. It was early in the Danube country, however, and that is a land where the fear of vampires is ancient and persisting. We may ask, therefore, whether the clause was meant to remove the convert's fear of evil things coming up from the underworld. The phrase about the "gatekeepers of Hades trembling" in the Dated Creed might fit that view. Again, on p. 134, Dr Kelly repeats his statement that "Christological summaries circulated freely as independent single-clause confessions of faith". Now Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I, x, 1) describes the Spirit as he who announced "the economies and the comings", and thereupon gives the historical clauses which make up the "Christological summary". This suggests that the interest underlying the summary was once that of fulfilment of prophecy, binding the Old Testament to the New, in despite of Marcion and the Gnostics. That, perhaps, was why the summary was first joined to the baptismal answer on the Son. But if so, days were to follow when its only meaning was as historical summary, so that Rufinus can treat it as an "intrusion" in the natural structure of baptismal faith. But it is exactly for its detailed reflection of the agelong plan mystically revealed in the Old Testament that Rufinus expounds it. On p. 38 the note number 37 has fallen out of its place. On p. 93 de Lubac's book should be dated 1950. These are thin "reviewer's gleanings", and this Vol. XX is a notable adornment to a series that is certainly justifying itself to a public "not confined to members of the Catholic Church".

W. Telfer.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

The Church of the Word Incarnate. Vol. I: The Apostolic Hierarchy. By Charles Journet. Translated by A. H. C. Downes. Sheed and Ward. 45s.

The scale on which Mgr Journet has designed his treatise on the Church can be judged from the fact that the volume now under review, which is only the first of four, contains considerably over three hundred thousand words. It is a model of systematic arrangement.

It is perhaps significant of the general bearing of Roman Catholic theology that a treatise on the Church should open with a discussion of the hierarchy. The reason for this is hardly less revealing. Mgr

Journet, as a good scholastic, had decided to divide his subject under the classical headings of the four causes—efficient, material, formal and final; and for him the immediate efficient cause producing the Church in the world consists of "the two powers, sacramental and jurisdictional, which by their union constitute the apostolic hierarchy". I do not know how far other Roman Catholics would agree with this identification of the Church's efficient cause; to an Anglican at least there seems something rather unbalanced in assigning quite such a prominent place to the hierarchy, however convinced he may be of its divine institution and its necessary place in the constitution of the Church. It is perhaps in consequence of this interpretation of the hierarchy in terms of efficient causality that Mgr Journet allows his discussion to be so much dominated by the ideas of jurisdiction and authority. It is true that he divides the functions of the hierarchy under the two powers of order and jurisdiction, but order receives about seventy pages while jurisdiction receives nearly four hundred. Given, however, his fundamental attitude it must be admitted that Mgr Journet has written a most impressive and erudite book, and some of his incidental discussions are of very great interest. Adopting M. Maritain's distinction between a secular (*profane*) and consecrational (*sacral*) régime of Christendom, he is able to argue that the particular type of intervention into the political realm which was characteristic of the medieval papacy represents not a permanent ideal but a transient analogical application of the principle of the supremacy of the sacred over the secular. He gives a frank and courageous account of such embarrassing matters as the attitude of the Church to heretics and to torture, and its participation in the Crusades. He is, however, led into what I cannot help thinking to be unnecessary complications by his determination to justify almost every recorded official decision of the Popes or the Roman Congregations. It is true that he is prepared to admit that the Church is fallible in what he rather strangely calls its "decisions of the biological order", that is, "prudential decisions whose end is empirically to determine the contingent relations of the Church with the world, to assure the concrete conditions of her daily existence", and, in a long excursus, he argues that the decrees of the judges against Galileo "were not guaranteed either as *absolute* and irreformable or even as *infallibly prudent*". These instances are, however, exceptional. In many of the awkward questions which he discusses, the plain and simple solution would seem to be that the ecclesiastical authorities made mistakes in matters which in any case were not clearly included in the sphere of defined infallibility. Mgr Journet's reluctance to adopt this solution frequently leads him either into elaborate, novel and often unconvincing distinctions or into a quite excessive view of the power of the Holy See to modify the constitution of the Church and the conditions of validity of the sacraments. However, until the other three volumes of his treatise are before us it is difficult to pass judgment upon the solutions which he offers.

M. Maritain is quoted on the dust-cover as saying: "In my opinion

not only is Mgr Journet the greatest living theologian, but his treatise on the Church is epoch-making and will become a classic." Even if we discount this estimate as over-exuberant we can hardly deny that Mgr Journet has produced a most impressive and useful treatise, though it is doubtful whether for theological insight it can stand comparison with Mersch's great unfinished work *Théologie du Corps Mystique*. At the very lowest estimate it will provide an invaluable work of reference, and so far from avoiding difficult questions the author is if anything over-anxious to seek for them. The question remains, however, whether his adoption of the Aristotelian four causes as the basis for a theology of the Church has not imposed upon his discussion an insuperable artificiality and lack of balance. The translation is clear and to all appearance accurate, but there are places in which its extreme literalness not only violates normal English usage but also defeats its own purpose by becoming unintelligible.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

The "Sensus Plenior" of Sacred Scripture. By R. E. Brown. St Mary's University, Baltimore. $2.00.

Scripture and Tradition. Essays edited by F. W. Dillistone. Lutterworth Press. 9s. 6d.

The first of these books is a doctoral thesis written by a very widely read and intelligent American of the Sulpician order, in which the author examines the various senses that have been derived from Scripture beyond the literal sense, and commends his own view that the most satisfactory description of this more-than-literal sense is *sensus plenior*, which he defines clearly (p. 92) as "an additional deeper meaning intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author", read into the text during development in the understanding of revelation. This thesis is written wholly within the limits of recent Roman Catholic definitions of inspiration and revelation, and assumes throughout that the proposition "God is the author of Holy Scripture" is both intelligible and acceptable (e.g. pp. 26, 47, 78–79, 92). The result of this position is that an inescapable air of unreality lies over all his work, a pervading impression that he is dealing not with the Bible but with laboratory-made theological constructions. His summary history of Biblical exegesis is far too brief to be of much use; he deals with the development of exegesis from the Reformation till the present day in five pages (63–67), and does not seem to think it a particularly significant period. He never examines his theory of inspiration nor explains what is meant by claiming that God is the author of Holy Scripture. He never even opens the question of the relation of revelation to history nor of faith to history. He is consequently precluded from contributing anything very valuable to the debate about the interpretation of Scripture or to the problem of the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament.

Within its own narrow limits, however, this is a good and honest book. The author's judgment is sound and his style clear and, for an American, restrained (except for one foul phrase, p. 125, "the homogeneous plus-value of language"). He is ready to adopt many of the conclusions of modern scholarship, or at least is not dogmatically set against them. He has one most interesting suggestion about the application of his *sensus plenior* to the Gospels resembling the conclusions of the Form Critics (p. 145), and it is possible that if he would examine his assumptions and tackle seriously the question of the relation of revelation to history he might be able to show convincingly that there was something in his *sensus plenior*. At any rate, we must welcome the keen interest in the interpretation of Scripture, and the honesty of purpose behind it, which studies such as this one reveal to exist among Roman Catholic scholars.

The second book consists of four essays on the important and topical subject of Scripture and Tradition, written by a number of scholars belonging to the Evangelical Fellowship of Theological Literature, with a short introduction by Dr F. W. Dillistone. By far the best of the four is that by Mr F. J. Taylor on "The Anglican Reformation". This is a first-class survey of the subject as it was dealt with in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The author sees all the problems and handles them with ability and judgment, though of course he only brings us as far as the Anglican theologians of those centuries had attained in considering the subject. Prof. G. W. H. Lampe's essay on "The Early Church" deals with a very difficult subject with notable success. We do not learn, it is true, what exactly the Fathers meant by "the rule of faith" and almost nothing is said about creeds. Again, the author hardly does justice to Origen, who did not suppose, as is implied on p. 46, that his esoteric *gnosis* derived in unwritten continuity from the apostles; and he cannot compare with Irenaeus and Tertullian in emphasis upon the episcopal guardianship of the rule of faith. But nobody could be expected to cover all the points in an essay of thirty-odd pages, and Dr Lampe has achieved a remarkably well-proportioned survey.

The essay by the Bishop of Leicester on "The Nineteenth Century" is a most disappointing affair, sketchy, mainly summarizing and almost wholly inconclusive. This chapter, which is supposed to cover Scripture and Tradition in the nineteenth century, makes no attempt whatever to describe, far less to discuss, Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine*. The last essay, by Archdeacon D. E. W. Harrison, on "The Situation To-day", begins by appearing really to tackle the problem. It soon, however, diverges to discuss the question of how Christianity is influenced by historical change and ends by wondering in a faintly homiletical manner how we can best appeal to contemporary man. At no point does the author attempt to face the challenge represented by Newman's work.

In short, the first two essays of this work give a bright promise which is not fulfilled in the last two. It is deplorable that modern Anglican theologians, writing on Scripture and Tradition, should not even try to take account of Newman's thought upon the subject.

We have no doubt that the group from which this volume came has in it resources enough to give useful guidance on how Anglicans should approach this subject to-day, but this book does not draw on them.

University of Nottingham. R. P. C. Hanson.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Contemplative Activity. By Pepita Haezrahi. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

The author of this book took her Master's Degree at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and after coming to England and taking the Ph.D. gained a Research Fellowship at Newnham. Her book consists of a striking essay in the philosophy of aesthetics. She insists that the hard core of the investigation lies not in the study of beauty nor in any philosophy of art, though these are essential, but in the recognition of the aesthetic experience as such. This is analysed and shown to consist in a particular kind of perception and a particular attitude to the thing perceived. But the experience is essentiallly non-emotional, and emotional attitudes have the effect of reducing the aesthetic element. The person remains throughout a spectator. The attitudes of the critic and the artist as well as those who make use of works of art for moral, religious, political or any other purposes are all differentiated from the aesthetic, though they may help as disciplines to achieve a more adequate response. But the passive spectator is something quite other than the active creator. If there is beauty in a poem or a picture it is because the artist laboured to put it there and the effect of it upon the beholder should not affect the objective quality of the work of art at all. Interesting and incisive though the essay certainly is, it seems to be divorced from metaphysical considerations, and one reader remains questioning as to what is the basis of the recognition of beauty.

Bangalore. Leonard M. Schiff.

Spiritual Perspectives and Human Facts. By Frithjof Schuon. Faber and Faber. 21s.

M. Schuon is in the line of the late Réné Guénon and A. K. Coomaraswamy—thinkers whose aim was to present the *real* inwardness of Eastern thought. M. Schuon, like them, is scornful of the "neo-Yogist" popularizers, and though he has a wide knowledge of orthodox Upanishadic and Vedantist teaching, as well as of Buddhist and Sufist, he manages to combine it with a remarkable acquaintance with the Fathers of the Church and the mystical theology of Eastern Orthodoxy. The most interesting chapter is that on the Vedanta—though it assumes more knowledge than the average reader will bring to it. His awareness of the dogmatic basis of Christian orthodoxy saves his demonstrations of parallelism between East and West from being a mere plea for a levelling kind of syncretism. The book

is written in a series of aphorisms, sometimes jerky sometimes winning, sometimes profoundly illuminating and sometimes concealing weighty platitudes beneath its skilful epigrams. I fear that a semantically minded logical analyst would make short work of some of its pronouncements (e.g. "In a certain sense *Maya* represents the possibility for Being of not being. The All-Possibility must by definition and on pain of contradiction include its own impossibility. . . . If the soul obtains deliverance, that is because Being is"). We should have expected the book to have an index and a bibliography.

JOHANNESBURG. MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C.R.

SPIRITUAL VALUES IN SHAKESPEARE. By Ernest Marshall Howse. Abingdon Press. $2.50.

This book is based on addresses given to various congregations, containing a high proportion of students, in the United States and Canada. The author's method is to give the story of a play—he has a witty transatlantic idiom—and comment on the characterization and its moral implications. After an introduction on the historical relations of drama and history, eight plays are dealt with, and a concluding chapter maintains the doubtful opinion that Shakespeare was chiefly concerned with individuals, though rightly emphasizing that they are "responsible" individuals and live in a moral order. Dr Howse is not unacquainted with Shakespearian scholarship, but too often it is the "follies of the academic mind" which engage his attention. A deeper acquaintance might have suggested some modification of his present views. Surely private vengeance is not axiomatic in *Hamlet* but is one of the problems of this difficult play, which is far more than a "tragedy of indecision". Was Othello "ruined only by his virtues" or by the sin of pride, as Prof. G. R. Elliott well argues in his *Flaming Minister*? Except with reference to *The Tempest*, there seems to be no recognition that Shakespeare's poetry is highly symbolic, founded in a Christian view of the world, and that it expresses theological as well as moral truth. (There is, for example, more about repentance and forgiveness than Dr Howse has discovered.) Dr Howse over-simplifies, sometimes to the point of distortion, but young people will enjoy his fresh and lively manner, while clergymen and teachers should benefit from his example and technique. Simple sermons in modern idiom based on this year's School Cert. play might not be a bad thing.

CARDIFF. S. L. BETHELL.

FORTITUDE AND TEMPERANCE. By Josef Pieper (translated by D. F. Coogan). Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.

Dr Pieper states the aim and method of this book: "Christian truth is in its origin and primarily in the custody of the teaching office of the Church; the individual possesses it only when he lives in union with the Church and hearkens by faith to her teaching.

Accordingly, this excursus makes no claim whatever to originality of thought. Rather, it contains not a single sentence that could not be documented from the works of St Thomas Aquinas" (p. 15). It contains little that is not to be found with a lot more in the Bishop of Exeter's *The Elements of Moral Theology*. Apart from two summary references no attempt is made to relate the traditional teaching to the observations of modern psychology. But without this attempt the traditional teaching remains open to question to-day.

R. R. Acheson.

Bristol.

The Gospel of Victory. By M. A. C. Warren. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

When Dr Warren of the C.M.S. was invited by the University of Durham to give four pastoralia lectures in the spring of 1953 he chose as his theme St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

Those whose task it is to expound the Scriptures will agree that, for all its passion, this very human document does not easily surrender its inwardness. Relate it to its historical background and you become involved in some of the most teasing disputes of New Testament criticism. Attempt a detailed exposition of the text and you soon run into the famous verse which is said to yield three hundred different interpretations. A commentary cannot avoid these rocks.

It is the great merit of this book that the author, building his discourse round four key passages, with easy mastery, and the briefest reference to his own views on disputed questions, brings the Epistle to life, at the same time revealing his understanding of Pauline thought—his exposition of all that Abraham meant to St Paul is most illuminating—and using the wealth of his own experience of missionary problems to show its great relevance to our time and our responsibilities. The Epistle is concerned with revival.

The reader who co-operates, as the author suggests, by first reading the Epistle through, will not only return to it, after studying the book, with renewed understanding and insight, but will find that he has been guided beyond the point at which study becomes transformed into prayer.

M. Burdess.

Ormskirk.

The Life of Jesus Christ. By J. W. C. Wand. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

Only Son. By Walter Farrell, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

The Dialogues of Jesus. Edited by Claude Chavasse. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

Comparisons need not be odious. Comparison indeed may best bring out the contrasting merits of Dr Wand's and Fr Farrell's books. Of the Twelve, for instance, Dr Wand writes: "The Twelve chosen by Jesus were a curiously mixed body. Not all of them attained distinction, and there seems to be some hesitation in the records about

even the names of the less known." Contrast Fr Farrell's statement as of fact that James the son of Alphaeus, Simon the Zealot and Judas, not Iscariot, "were cousins of our Lord, possibly brought up in the same house with him . . . called anyhow, by a common Jewish usage, his brothers". The one writes as a historian in a matter-of-fact style, objectively, yet with his own presupposition of faith clear enough. The other writes devotionally, speculatively, romantically. Of the home at Nazareth says Fr Farrell: "To Joseph here in the evening, Mary's flaming sanctity would light up her every act, her smiles, her least gesture, her face in repose, to make of them a fire warming a man to his very depths. . . ." Fr Farrell shares with us his poetic, yet virile, apprehension of the mystery of Christ's two natures. Dr Wand, the experienced historian, almost persuades us that he has conformed the gospel material to a coherent sequence of events. Certainly he lends coherence to the gospel teaching in excellent chapters on "the Story-Teller" and "the Teacher".

Mr Chavasse would tell the same story, but in the actual gospel words. "Feeling that the repetition of the words 'answered and said' occurred too often in the fourth chapter" of the Fourth Gospel, he concluded "that for a modern reader the direct speech is better shown in dialogue form as we see in Plato's Dialogues". So with little violence to the text, he presents the gospel in the form of a play, for speaking rather than acting, complete with footnotes and stage directions. Two uses are suggested: as a Lent book and for reading in school.

He felt constrained, however, to rearrange the text according to Bernard's hypothesis. Whatever its merits, this rearrangement may distract and irritate the devotional reader and confuse the school-children, introducing irrelevant difficulties into their minds. I may not be alone in having had to "re-rearrange" Dr Temple's *Readings* back to normal for teaching purposes. And is it a misplaced reverence to reject, as the evangelist himself did, a starkly dramatic form for his admittedly dramatic gospel? It is all very well for Socrates. But which boy or girl is to read the part of the Christ?

All three books stand the searching test of transplantation to the tropics. It is some years now since a missionary headmaster in these parts threatened to cane every boy he found reading the Bible, so universal was the custom of hypocritically opening a Bible whenever he loomed in sight. But that attitude to the Bible among the young remains in some quarters, alas! *The Dialogues of Jesus* might play its part in substituting a more living interest. Dr Wand's book may be just right for the Westernized intellectual with nothing yet to replace his ancestral Hindu faith now in process of abandonment. And Fr Farrell's might be made obligatory reading for all our graduate clergy. Our Bible tradition would protect us against his fantasies. But it is in such books as this, rather than in nasty pictures of the Sacred Heart, or even pious manuals of private devotion, that we may learn something distinctive from our Roman Catholic neighbours about the Incarnate God whom they with us adore.

PALAMCOTTAH. A. H. DAMMERS.

A Priest's Work in Hospital. Edited by J. Gordon Cox. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Creative Suffering. By Amy E. Blake. S.P.C.K. 1s.

The Place of Healing in the Ministry of the Church. By George F. Macleod. Iona Community Pamphlets, Glasgow. 9d.

The Healing Christ. By Ian Cowie. Iona Community Pamphlets, Glasgow. 6d.

Caring for People. By James Maitland. Iona Community Pamphlets, Glasgow. 6d.

No Anglican clergyman can do hospital work without soon or late developing an inferiority complex. The staff either ignore him or, the more devout among them, hint at his deficiencies. The patients either want more of him or less; some write to his bishop, others to the Management House Committee. He learns from one source or another how inferior he is to the Roman Catholic priest, the Nonconformist minister and the Jewish rabbi. Not one of the various specialities within the sacred ministry calls for more grace and patience and longsuffering with cheerfulness. This "Handbook for Hospital Chaplains and others of the Clergy who visit Hospitals" is therefore highly to be commended as timely and on the practical level useful. Naturally there is some advice which cannot always be followed and some exhortation which is we hope unnecessary, since most hospital chaplains will have already as curate or vicar served a parish or otherwise acquired some pastoral experience. The charts and the illustrations (which have no doubt increased the price) do not seem particularly helpful or illuminating; the latter incidentally give the impression that the modern hospital has no members of the male sex among its staff or patients. However, allowing for the impossibility of producing a handbook applicable to all types of hospital, the several contributions to this symposium should prove interesting and useful to all who are called to this arduous and exacting service.

Not so the opening chapter on the theology of the chaplain's work, which would serve better as an introduction to a treatise than a preliminary to a handbook. Its subtle and confusing distinctions, whether "classical" or not, its parenthetical digressions, its "tentative solutions", its desiccated schematisms, carry the reader to the divinity lecture room rather than to the hospital ward or canteen where ordinary folk with ordinary incapacity for abstract ideas meditate on their pains, anxieties, temptations and boredom. And if this opening essay is aimed at the clerical reader then it must be said that chaplains, full or part-time, possess only a given *quantum* of mental energy or expository *expertise*. All of us have to make up our minds what God has called us to do and be, and the man called to minister in even a small hospital or institution must be prepared to forgo the delights of theological study and the precepts of the professors. Otherwise he will talk in a tongue not understanded of the people.

In the sense of putting the spiritual practitioner in the right frame of mind, Mrs A. E. Blake's much shorter essay on the Chris-

tian interpretation of suffering will better reward a thoughtful reader. Free from the clichés of the schools, it is more direct, sympathetic, memorable and quotable at the bedside or in the argument with the transport drivers: the agelong answers to the rebels among the sufferers are redeployed with an occasional analogy or relevant reminiscence.

The three pamphlets put forth by the Iona Community are directed to support the thesis that there is no conflict between science and religion; there are not two kinds of healing, one Christian and one medical; true, most patients need a confessor more than they do a physician, yet a cure through penicillin is as much God's work as a cure through the laying on of hands. The reprint of the article by the leader of the Community focuses the conclusions of ten years' evolving experience, and underlines the urgency of a reconsideration of healing through the Church—a conviction only too sadly reinforced by the horrible tale in the author's last paragraph. "We cannot afford to do nothing."

BRITFORD, WILTS. W. G. ADDISON.

LIFE TOGETHER. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.
TEMPTATION. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

Life Together contains five chapters: "Community", "The Day with Others", "The Day Alone", "Ministry", and "Confession and Communion". Seldom has so much spiritual wisdom been compressed within so small a space. There is an extraordinary depth and maturity in everything that Bonhoeffer wrote, and Christians of all traditions will find here a most rewarding light cast on various aspects of their daily life and, not least, on their devotions.

Temptation consists of Bible studies that were prepared for a reunion of clergy. It is theologically more recondite, and may at first introduce confusion into its readers' minds about the different meanings of temptation. But it will be the kind of confusion that is worth clearing up.

TO WHOM SHALL WE GO? By D. M. Ballie. St Andrew Press, Edinburgh. 15s.

Professor D. M. Baillie's book *God was in Christ* is the most valuable British work on Christology that has appeared since the second world war, and his death last year was a serious loss to British theology. The sermons in this volume reveal him as a preacher who could expound the great themes of the faith with splendid clarity, simplicity and directness. The interesting memoir, contributed by Professor John Dow, is marred by a rhetorical exuberance quite alien to Baillie himself.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON